



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PTO

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,779	02/20/2004	Yu Gong	50277-2334	6676

29989 7590 10/06/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/783,779		GONG, YU	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper		2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 36-70 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/11/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application 10783779 filed on 2/20/2004.

Claims 1-70 are currently pending in this office action.

Claim Objections

Claims 36-70 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 36-70 a computer – readable medium claims carrying one or more sequences of instructions corresponding to method claims 1-35 respectively, but the claims are written in dependent form. Since claims 1-35 are methods for loading database data into a target database comprising machine implemented steps of... examiner notes that each of the claims 1-35 and their corresponding dependent computer readable medium claim both must use instructions to implement the steps of the claim. Examiner recommends rewriting claims 35-70 as independent-dependent combinations similar to claims 1-35. For the purposes art rejection in this office action claims 35-70 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-35 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5890167 (hereinafter Bridge) in view of US 20040034615 (hereinafter Thom).

As for claim 1 Bridge discloses: analyzing metadata that describes one or more items (See column 3 lines 51-55), the data for which is in a source database (See column 3 lines 47-50), wherein the metadata for the database object is stored outside of the source database and the target database (See column 8 lines 42-45 note: there are the databases and the data dictionary); wherein data for said one or more items resides in a data file associated with said source database (See column 6 lines 40-44); incorporating the data for said one or more items into the target database by providing said target database access to an incorporated data file (See column 6 lines 43-45), wherein said incorporated data file is said data file or a copy thereof (See column 7 lines

Art Unit: 2166

23-26); and accessing in the target database the data for said one or more items based on the metadata that defines said one or more items (See column 8 lines 42-45). While Bride does not substantially differ from the claimed invention the disclosure of wherein the one or more items include at least one of a view, a sequence, a dimension, a cube, an ETL mapping, a queue, an external table, a stored procedure, and a database object is not necessarily explicit. Thom however does explicitly disclose wherein the one or more items include at least one of a view, a sequence, a dimension, a cube, an ETL mapping, a queue, an external table, a stored procedure, and a database object (See paragraph 0009). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Thom into the system of Bridge. The modification would have been obvious because users want to have the ability to extract and translate databases from one form to another (See Thom paragraph 0011).

As for claim 2 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more database views from the source database, and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more database views (See paragraph 0009).

As for claim 3 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more database sequences from the source database (See column 3 lines 50-55), and the step of analyzing

Art Unit: 2166

metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more database sequences (See column 3 lines 51-55 note: dictionary contains sequence information).

As for claim 4 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more database dimensions from the source database (See paragraph 0046), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more database dimensions (See paragraph 0107).

As for claim 5 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more database cubes from the source database (See paragraph 0046), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more database cubes (See paragraph 0095).

As for claim 6 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more ETL mappings from the source database, and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata

Art Unit: 2166

that describes said one or more ETL mappings (See paragraph 0416).

As for claim 7 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more queues from the source database (See column 3 lines 50-55), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more queues (See column 9 lines 30-40).

As for claim 8 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more external tables from the source database (See column 6 lines 46-50), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more external tables (See column 7 lines 30-35).

As for claim 9 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more stored procedures from the source database (See column 3 lines 50-55), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more stored procedures (See column 7 lines 5-10 note: there inherently must be some stored procedures to

accomplish the table-space method of transformation).

As for claim 10 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein said one or more items include one or more database objects from the source database (See column 3 lines 50-55), wherein the metadata for the one or more database objects is stored outside of the source database and the target database (See column 6 lines 50-52 note: metadata is also in dictionary which is outside the file), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database comprises the step of analyzing metadata that describes said one or more database objects (See column 7 lines 33-37).

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein the target database stores data in a data files that have a first format, the incorporated data file is in a second format that is different from the first format, and wherein a database server that manages the target database accesses the one or more items from said incorporated data file (See paragraphs 0051,0064).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein a source database server manages data from said source database, a target database server manages data from said target database (See paragraph 0054), and the step of analyzing metadata that describes one or more items, the data for which is in a source database is performed at least in part by a process that is

Art Unit: 2166

separate from said source database server and said target database server (See paragraph 0058).

As for claim 13 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein at least a portion of said metadata is read from a source repository separate from said source database (See column 2 lines 5-10).

As for claim 14 the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein a source database server manages data from said source database, a target database server manages data from said target database (See paragraph 0054), and said source repository is a repository associated with an application separate from both said source database server and said target database server (See paragraph 0011 note: OLAP is designed to work with different applications).

As for claim 15 the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein said application is an extraction, transformation and loading application (See paragraph 0057).

As for claim 16 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: the step of analyzing is performed by one or more processes and the method further comprises the step of the one or more processes obtaining over a network said metadata that describes said one or more items from said source database (See

Art Unit: 2166

paragraph 0054).

As for claim 17 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further discloses: wherein the step of analyzing is performed by one or more processes and the method further comprises said one or more processes reading at least a portion of the metadata from a machine-readable medium while said machine-readable medium resides at a first location, wherein the metadata about said items was recorded to the machine-readable medium at a second location See column 6 lines 50-52 note: metadata in dictionary is in a separate location).

Claims 18-33 are method for exporting database data claims corresponding to claims 1-16 respectively, and are thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claims 1-16.

As for claim 34, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated and further Thom discloses: wherein the step of sending over a network further comprising the step of sending the metadata using the file transfer protocol (See paragraph 0054).

As for claim 35, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further Bridge discloses: wherein the step of extracting is performed by one or more processes and the method further comprises said one or more processes writing to a machine-readable medium said metadata that describes said one or more items from the source

Art Unit: 2166

database (See column 6 lines 45-51 note: each table-space and a file is a separate process).

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH
Leon J. Harper
September 29, 2006



MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER